

legitimate to ask about them whether, on the whole, the larger ones owed their superiority in size to their being longer or to their being wider than the others? The answer could be obtained in the form of correlation by measuring first the correlation between area and length and then between area and width.

To find out whether in one particular group of men one particular character has been influenced more by heredity than by environment is a necessary first step towards solving the problem suggested by the third meaning of the phrase to be considered; namely, have all characters in all men been more influenced by heredity than by environment?

Fourthly, one may consider, not the influence of heredity and environment acting on individuals, but their action through many generations on the race. This involves the consideration of most theories of evolution and the evidence and reasoning on which they are based.

Fifthly, one may enquire whether we can improve the qualities of animals or human beings more effectively by adjusting their environment, or by selective breeding.

EDGAR SCHUSTER.

"DEPOPULATION."

I have thought for some time that there is a danger lest the Eugenics Education Society should seem to be committed to a view of the population question which has certainly no connection with eugenics. The last number of the REVIEW has increased my fear that this conclusion will be drawn. Eugenists cannot consistently hold that a rapid increase of population is necessarily a good thing. The aggregation of multitudes in large towns, the progressive defacement of our beautiful country, the pressure of a permanent surplus of labourers who cannot obtain work, the fierce competition which is a necessary concomitant of a dense population—all these are dysgenic factors, and things to be deplored. Three classes only, it seems to me, are interested in raising the ridiculous cry of "depopulation"—ridiculous, because the births in this country exceed the deaths by about five to three, and even in France the numbers are increasing. These classes are—first, the militarists, who look upon men as food for powder. This is notoriously the motive of the agitation in France. Secondly, the capitalists, who desire an unlimited quantity of cheap labour, with a margin which will give them a favourable position in bidding for it. Thirdly, the advocates of cut-throat competition as the means of producing the maximum of industrial efficiency. Our society cannot have the slightest sympathy with any of these ideas. I believe myself that the fall in the birth-rate has been an unmixed benefit for the working class, and has, perhaps, saved the country from revolution. If the increase in the population could be entirely stopped, poverty would be reduced automatically, and the most difficult of our social problems would be in a fair way to be solved. The abject condition of the bulk of the population in China, where the labourers are exceedingly thrifty, ingenious, and industrious, and where there is no capitalism to saddle with their deplorable state, is an incontrovertible proof that over-population is a prime cause of misery. Nor has that nation attained any formidable degree of military efficiency. History

shows that in war, as in other things, quality is more important than quantity. This, at any rate, is the principle for which eugenics stands. Our business is the improvement of the human stock, not the multiplication of human beings.

I have no connection with the Malthusian league. I do not like their methods, and should never recommend them. But, at least, they see where the shoe pinches. I must add that to connect them with societies which recommend abortion (*EUGENICS REVIEW*, July, p. 139) is an injustice for which I think regret ought to be expressed.

W. R. INGE.

EUGENICS AND THE SUNDAY SCHOOL TEACHER.

There seems to be unanimity of opinion with regard to the desirability of spreading eugenic ideas among teachers of all kinds. Hence it strikes one as worthy of consideration whether an effort might be made to interest Sunday school teachers in the subject.

The two chief objections to this suggestion would seem to be (1) that not even Church of England Sunday schools are sufficiently organised for their staff to have a recognisable corporate existence, as such, (2) that direct eugenic instruction is outside the scope and intention of their work, which usually follows a plan laid down by the clergy for whom they work.

But (1) Church of England Sunday schools are being organised more and more completely and efficiently. Classes and educational lectures are held for teachers in various centres. (2) Direct eugenic instruction is, of course, out of place, but a capable Sunday School teacher frequently comes into touch with pupils beyond the lesson hour, and has an influence over the more receptive among them. The presence of the moral eugenic ideal in the teacher's mind, backed, if possible, by at least a rudimentary knowledge of biology and the accepted facts of heredity, must have a definite value in the long run.

To show that a religion cannot be complete that does not take full cognisance of the value of the human envelope in which the spirit is wrapped, to point out the solemnity of life, physical as well as moral, and the sacredness of parenthood, not only from a filial point of view, may not be invariably beyond the Sunday school teacher's scope. And further, the fundamental lesson of self-control, upon which all practice must be based, can be taught to the youngest child, in its elementary bearings. To come to a practical suggestion. Would it be possible to induce such an association as the Church of England Sunday School Institute, Serjeant's Inn, which, I believe, organises teachers' courses of lectures, to take up the consideration of the subject?

Perhaps a simple leaflet—non-technical and educative—might be written and sent to such an association for distribution among teachers. It would have to be worded very simply, and also carefully, to avoid offending delicate susceptibilities, and must, of course, contain nothing that would not meet with the approval of the clergy who direct the schools.

But such a large and earnest body of voluntary workers in a good cause would be worth enlisting as sympathisers, at least, with the eugenic educational movement.

K. B. BAMFIELD.